

## REMARKS

The Office Action of June 12, 2008 addressed to Claims 1-6 as presented originally (by preliminary amendment), contains a 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection founded on Masuda et al. (the WO 2003/071014 application using EP 1479798 for translation purposes), Hochberg et al. U.S. Pat. No. 4,732,921 and Guthrie et al. U.S. Pat. No. 4,001,921. The Examiner contends that Masuda et al. discloses a composition for formulating artificial hair that is rendered flame retardant by the addition of an organic cyclic phosphorus compound thereto, such phosphorus compounds may be phosphites, and the fibers range from 30-70 dtex, but Masuda et al. does not teach the addition of a brominated epoxy compound to the polyester artificial hair. The Examiner further contends that Hochberg et al. teaches a flame-resistant polyester composition comprising polybutylene terephthalate, the composition may also include a brominated epoxy based flame retardant, and the compositions comprise 100 parts by weight of polyester and 5 to 30 parts by weight of the bromine containing flame retardant. From these contentions, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the artificial hair composition of Masuda et al. by adding the brominated flame retardant of Hochberg et al. thereto to drive the usual flame rearding properties associated with the epoxy compounds. The Examiner opines that an ordinarily skilled practitioner of the art would also have been expected to have derive the added advantage of improving the fatigue strength and the melt flow.

The Examiner further contends that Guthrie et al. teaches a polyethylene therephthalate composition which is spun into a yarn, that this composition can be treated with tris (dibromopropyl) phosphate and that the tris (dibromopropyl) phosphate is one of the most frequently employed flame retardants. From this, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the polyester composition of Masuda et al. with the tris (dibromopropyl) phosphate of Guthrie et al. to confer known flame retardant properties thereto.

Claim 1 is the only independent claim in the application and remains in independent form. However, Claim 1 has been amended to define a critical limitation. Claim 1 now

contains the limitation that “(C) a reaction accelerator which accelerates the reactions between terminal carboxylic acid groups of the component (A) and epoxy group of the component (B).” Applicants respectfully submit that none of the aforescribed references discloses or teaches “(C) a reaction accelerator which accelerates the reaction between terminal carboxylic acid group of the component (A) and epoxy group of the component (B)” according to amended claim 1. Furthermore, the excellent effect of improving the transparency of obtained filament according to amended claim 1 is neither disclosed nor inherent in any of these references. Accordingly, amended independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-7 each define subject matter which is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-7 should be allowable. Passage of the application is believed to be in order.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard G. Lione/  
Richard G. Lione  
Reg. No. 19,795  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200